

## REMARKS

### Objections to the Specification:

Applicants have amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner.

### Rejection of the Claims under 35 USC § 112:

Claims 1, 18, 20, 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite with respect to the term “compound”. Applicants have amended the claims to obviate the rejection. Specifically, Applicants have amended claims 1, 29 and 30 to incorporate the limitations of claims 2, 4 and 8, which the examiner indicated as having allowable subject matter.

Claim 1, 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite with respect to the method of attachment. Applicants have amended the claims to incorporate the limitation of claim 18: covalently attachment. Claim 18 has been canceled.

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite with respect to the term “PEG”. Applicants have amended the claim to cite the term “polyethylene glycol” instead of the abbreviation as recommended by the Examiner.

Claims 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for not reasonably providing enablement for a composition comprising any compound targeted to hepatocytes in vivo with a T7 ligand. Applicants have amended the claims to obviate the rejection.

Specifically, Applicants have amended the claims to incorporate the limitations of claims 2, 4 and 8. Support for delivery of a drug to hepatocytes is supported by delivery of yellow fluorescent protein in example 4 on page 27, streptavidin in examples 7 and 8 starting on page 28, and interferon in example 5 starting on page 27. Support for delivery of a complex to hepatocytes is supported by delivery of dextran-streptavidin complexes in example 8 starting on page 30. Support for delivery of a polynucleotide to hepatocytes is supported by delivery of siRNA in example 8 starting on page 30.

Claim 26 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants have canceled the claim, therefore obviating the rejection.

Rejection of the Claims under 35 USC 102:

Claims 1, 12-15 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Studier. Applicants have amended the claims to obviate the rejection. It is the Applicants opinion that Studier does not disclose covalent attachment of a T7 ligand to a drug, complex or polynucleotide.

The Examiner's objections and rejections are now believed to be overcome by this response to the Office Action. In view of Applicants' amendment and arguments, it is submitted that claims 1, 3, 5-17, 20-25 and 27-30 should be allowable. Applicants respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in the case.

Respectfully submitted,



Kirk Ekena Reg. No.56672  
Mirus Bio  
505 South Rosa Road  
Madison, WI 53719  
608-238-4400

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as express mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this date: 05/03/2005.



Kirk Ekena